DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 665 EA 031 780

AUTHOR	Hara, Shelly
TITLE	What Every Educator Should Know...About the Changing Social Policy Landscape and Efforts To Ensure Student Success. Issue Brief.
INSTITUTION	Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC. Resource Center on Educational Equity.
SPONS AGENCY	Kraft General Foods Foundation, Glenview, IL; Danforth Foundation, Clayton, MO; Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, Kansas City, MO.; Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	40p.; Bill Shepardson contributed significantly to the writing and editing. Also supported by the Stuart Foundation. Also published and disseminated through the Laboratory for Student Success (1998-15).
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Chief State School Officers, One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20001-1431. Tel: 202-408-5505; Fax: 202-408-8072; Web site: http://www.ccsso.org. For full text: http://www.ccsso.org/pdfs/ibspr98.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Role; Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Public Service; School Policy; *Strategic Planning

ABSTRACT

This issue brief examines how policies and programs for children and families are changing. It focuses on specific trends in human services, health care, economic development, youth development, and education and describes the implications of these changes for educators and school-community partnerships, paying special attention to the role that such partnerships can play in improving the lives of children and their families. The brief discusses the rising call for accountability, the need for more flexibility in states and localities, and the increasing coordination and integration of services. Specific developments in child and family policies and programs are welfare reform (block grants, child care and nutrition, food stamps, benefits to immigrants, the Social Services Block Grant, Medicaid, child support, teen parents, school readiness, and expanded support services); work-force development; health care; community and economic development; youth development; federal education programs, including Goals 2000; the Ed-Flex Demonstration Program; Title I; safe and drug-free schools; flexible funding; IDEA reauthorization; the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; and adult and vocational education. How these changes will affect schools is addressed in each section. A final part describes how stakeholders can become a part of the solution. (Contains 12 references.) (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

I S S U E B R I E F

Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration

ED 467 665

WHAT EVERY EDUCATOR SHOULD KNOW...

About the Changing Social Policy Landscape and Efforts to Ensure Student Success

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. BUTERBAUGH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SPRING 1998

EA031780

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nationwide, nonprofit organization composed of the public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO seeks its members' consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public. Through its structure of standing and special committees, the Council responds to a broad range of concerns about education and provides leadership on major education issues.

Because the Council represents the chief education administrators, it has access to the educational and governmental establishment in each state and to the national influence that accompanies this unique position. CCSSO forms coalitions with many other education organizations and is able to provide leadership for a variety of policy concerns that affect elementary and secondary education. Thus, CCSSO members are able to act cooperatively on matters vital to the education of America's young people.

RESOURCE CENTER ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

The CCSSO Resource Center on Educational Equity provides services designed to achieve equity and high quality education for minorities, women and girls, the disabled, limited-English proficient, and low-income students. The Center is responsible for managing and staffing a variety of CCSSO leadership initiatives to ensure educational success for all children and youth, especially those placed at-risk.

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COLLABORATION PROJECTS

The Council's School-Community Collaboration projects help state education agencies (SEAs) foster the development of comprehensive community services that contribute to children's well-being and educational success. The Collaboration projects provide ongoing technical assistance and professional development opportunities to key state education agency staff, their colleagues in other agencies, and community representatives in seven states; prepare issue briefs and other guidance for chiefs on how SEAs, with other state and local agencies and organizations, can promote school-community collaboration that improves student achievement and other results for children and families; and collaborate with the Laboratory for Student Success, the mid-Atlantic regional educational laboratory at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education, on issues related to effective coordination between state and local agencies.

Council of Chief State School Officers
Wilmer S. Cody (Kentucky), President
Robert E. Bartman (Missouri), President-Elect
Henry R. Marockie (West Virginia), Vice President

Gordon M. Ambach, Executive Director
Cynthia G. Brown, Director, Resource Center on Educational Equity
One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001-1431
Phone: 202/408-5505
Fax: 202/408-8072
http://www.ccsso.org

Copyright ©1998 by the Council of Chief State School Officers

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank the individuals and organizations that made possible the production of *What Every Educator Should Know...* This issue brief was primarily authored by Shelly Hara, Senior Project Associate, Resource Center on Educational Equity. Bill Shepardson, Director, School-Community Collaboration projects, also contributed significantly to the writing and editing of this brief. The brief was written and produced under the guidance and direction of Bill Shepardson and Cynthia G. Brown, Director, Resource Center on Educational Equity.

This work was made possible through the generous support of the Kraft General Foods Foundation, as well as the Annie E. Casey, Danforth, Ewing Marion Kauffman, and Stuart Foundations. The opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the foundations that have funded this work.

This issue brief also will be co-published and disseminated through the Laboratory for Student Success, the mid-Atlantic regional educational laboratory at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ALL STUDENTS ACHIEVING, NO EXCUSES 1

NEW APPROACHES FOR CHANGING TIMES 3

HOW POLICIES AND PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ARE CHANGING 5

- More Flexibility for States and Localities 5
- The Call for Accountability 5
- Efforts to Control Costs 6
- Coordination and Integration of Services 7

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENTS IN CHILD AND FAMILY POLICIES AND PROGRAMS 9

HUMAN SERVICES 9

- Welfare Reform 9
  - Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant 9
  - Supplemental Security Income (SSI) 10
  - Child care 10
  - Child nutrition 10
  - Food stamps 11
  - Benefits to immigrants 11
  - Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) 11
  - Medicaid 11
  - Child support and child welfare 11
- Implications for Schools 11
  - Workforce development and school-to-career initiatives 12
  - Teen parents 12
  - School readiness 12
  - Expanded support services 12
  - Long-term effects 13
- Workforce Development 14
  - Job Training Partnership Act 14
  - Welfare-to-Work 15
- Implications for Schools 15
- Child Welfare 16
- Implications for Schools 17

HEALTH CARE 18

- Managed Care, Children's Health Insurance, and Medicaid 18
- Mental Health 19
- Implications for Schools 20

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 21
Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities 21
Housing 22
Implications for Schools 24
YOUTH DEVELOPMENT 24
Implications for Schools 26
FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS 27
Goals 2000: Educate America Act 27
Comprehensive school improvement plans 28
Ed-Flex Demonstration Program 28
Improving America's Schools Act 28
Title I 28
Safe and Drug-free Schools 29
Coordinated social and health services 29
Charter Schools Demonstration Program 30
Consolidated planning 30
Flexible funding 30
IDEA Reauthorization 31
The School-to-Work Opportunities Act 31
Adult and Vocational Education 31
Implications for Schools 32

BECOMING A PART OF THE SOLUTION 33

SELECTED REFERENCES AND RESOURCES 35

WHAT EVERY EDUCATOR SHOULD KNOW...

About the Changing Social Policy Landscape and Efforts to Ensure Student Success

ALL STUDENTS ACHIEVING, NO EXCUSES

High standards, high expectations for all students, accountability for results—these are the principles that guide successful education improvement efforts. Research and experience show that, given the opportunities and supports they need to master core knowledge in key subjects and learn to reason, communicate, and work effectively with others, virtually all students will achieve to high levels. But we have all heard the laments: *If only the kids were better prepared for school. If only the parents paid more attention. If only this neighborhood didn't have so many problems. If only we weren't expected to be teachers, social workers, nurses, traffic cops, and surrogate parents all at the same time. If only things were different, then we could do our jobs and our students could achieve.* However, if we are truly committed to assuring equity and excellence for our nation's young people, no excuses are acceptable. All schools and communities must be expected to do whatever it takes to make sure students succeed, regardless of income level, race, language, or neighborhood circumstances.

Along with this focus on accountability for results, comes a responsibility to make sure support, assistance, and information are available to help schools and communities with the task of boosting education results across the board while closing the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers. Schools that are failing their students aren't doing a bad job because they want to; they aren't succeeding because they don't know how to succeed. Much of the assistance that is needed involves helping schools organize around high standards. Schools need help enriching and accelerating the curriculum, supporting professional development and schoolwide planning, perfecting effective ways of teaching, and using new forms of assessment (The Education Trust, undated). In addition, schools need to understand the dynamics of the neighborhoods in which they are located and the opportunities and challenges presented by changes in policies and programs that determine what kinds of additional supports, services, and opportunities are available to support young people's learning and development.

NEW APPROACHES FOR CHANGING TIMES

Education improvement efforts must focus on improving what goes on in the classroom, but it has become increasingly clear that the most successful schools pay attention to enhancing opportunities for learning and development both inside and outside school. If all students are to be ready to learn when they enter school and if they are to make optimal use of learning opportunities, they must be healthy and emotionally prepared to be full participants in all of their educational experiences. While educators have been deeply involved in education improvement efforts, others have been working to change policies and programs in human services, health, youth development, and economic development to better support children and their families, especially those who live in poverty. These changes affect budding efforts of schools and communities to work closely together to achieve educational success.

Through school-community partnerships and school-linked services efforts, educators have found ways to connect with and integrate services and supports that help low-income children achieve academic success and develop into independent, educated, self-sufficient adults. These partnerships have become much more widespread as schools have sought out allies to provide additional support for students and their families to improve education-related results. Schools also have increasingly become more active partners in efforts to revitalize low-income communities and neighborhoods.

As these partnerships have developed, the social policy landscape has been undergoing dramatic changes, affecting in fundamental ways how services and supports for low-income families are delivered and administered. These changes have the potential for both positive and negative consequences for children and families, as well as for taxpayers. Although services and supports may be improved as a result of new trends in policy making and service delivery, with fewer resources available, they may not be adequate to meet the need. Currently, states and communities are deeply involved in planning for and implementing these changes, and many key decisions are being made that can and will significantly affect the educational success and well-being of children and youth.

Educators and others working to support children and families, particularly those living in high-poverty communities, must understand the range of efforts being made to improve results for children and families, take full advantage of the opportunities presented by the changing policy and service context, and also minimize the negative consequences these trends may have. That is, educators should work to optimize educational results by playing a role in improving support for families, as well as fully harness the power of education as the best preventive strategy to combat poverty and other social ills. To do this effectively, educators need to be aware of and involved in changes occurring in human services, health care, youth development, and economic development. They must also look carefully at recent changes in federal education policy to determine how they can be better partners in comprehensive approaches to supporting children and families.

This issue brief examines

- how policies and programs for children and families are changing;
- specific changes occurring in human services, health care, economic development, youth development, and education;

- the implications of these trends and developments for educators and school-community partnerships; and
- the opportunities for school-community partnerships to play a key role in improving the lives and life chances of children and their families in this new policy context.

Failure to pay attention to the noneducational needs of students could undermine efforts to improve the quality of education for all young people and may discourage families and communities from joining schools as full partners.

HOW POLICIES AND PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ARE CHANGING

In the past decade, our education, health care, and human services systems have undergone significant reform. Indeed, the call for "systems reform" has been heard, and significant progress to improve services and supports has been made in each of those domains. However, these individual reform efforts have much in common, and they reflect four interrelated trends that set the stage for new, crosscutting approaches to improving results for children and families. They are

- increased flexibility and authority for states and localities;
- an emphasis on accountability for results;
- efforts to contain costs; and
- more coordination and integration of once-disparate services and supports.

More Flexibility for States and Localities

Citizens and policy makers are now calling for a smaller role for the federal government on the grounds that its programs are too categorical, rigid, and centralized to meet the varied and complex needs of individuals and families served by these programs or to address the needs and problems unique to individual communities. Indeed, many services and supports might best be designed and administered in communities, as close to those being served as possible.

Changes in federal legislation and efforts by the Clinton administration to alter and reduce the federal role in the provision of services and supports for children and families have provided new flexibility and transferred new and increased responsibilities and authority to the state and local levels. A number of federal departments have been aggressive in responding to and granting waiver requests. Waivers allow public entities, such as state education, health, or human services agencies, to be excused from complying with a particular provision of a law or regulation, providing the original intent of the law or program is upheld. For example, a state may request a waiver from the Health Care Financing Administration to require that all its Medicaid participants be enrolled in managed care programs.

Federal policy makers have also reduced the number of federal regulations for programs, allowing states to set their own eligibility standards and guidelines for services within broad parameters. The new welfare block grant, for example, sets time limits and work requirements, but allows states to determine eligibility and how federal dollars will be used to move welfare families toward self-sufficiency. Generally, the federal government is placing less emphasis on how and what services are to be delivered and is placing greater emphasis on the results to be achieved by the programs. These recent efforts have given states and communities the flexibility and the authority to work toward designing new programs that are more responsive, comprehensive, and individualized for their neediest populations.

The Call for Accountability

The federal government has been more willing to give up control of many programs and provide increased flexibility to states and communities, but it has only been willing to do so with the assurance that states and localities will achieve meaningful results and be accountable for achieving those results.

For many public programs, progress traditionally has been measured by looking at the service delivery process or "inputs" to service systems, rather than results or outcomes. For example, in the past states have been asked to report how many people were enrolled in job training programs rather than how many participants were able to find and keep jobs.

Changing to a focus on results is not an easy process. Before states and communities can decide how to address problems, policy makers and those who work in or are otherwise affected by these programs must agree on what results are to be achieved and how progress toward achieving those results will be measured and tracked. There may be logistical challenges involved in getting the needed data, and there also must be adequate technology to maintain and manage data using appropriate information management systems.

Educators have been under increasing pressure to see that all students achieve to high levels and to show improved results, and they are already making steady progress in measuring academic performance. Therefore, the education system is well positioned to contribute to efforts to look at the effects of new policies, such as welfare reform, on student achievement. However, educators will also be among the first to see the noneducational and potentially negative effects of welfare reform on children, and they could also participate in efforts to examine and monitor how new laws affect vulnerable children and families.

Efforts to Control Costs

Under pressure to balance the budget, reduce the deficit, and cut taxes, the federal government has been seeking ways to both slow rapidly escalating costs (those associated with health care and entitlement programs, for example), and cut costs of social programs generally. In the last few years, some policy makers have advocated converting entitlement programs—those programs that guarantee assistance to anyone who qualifies, such as welfare—to block grant programs, in which the federal government gives states a capped amount of money to serve their needy populations, regardless of demand for services. Another method of reducing expenditures is to restrict eligibility for programs, as the new welfare law did by initially making all legal immigrants ineligible for Supplemental Security Income and food stamps (some remain ineligible).

Other recent efforts at cost-cutting have assumed that states and localities can streamline their programs if they can contend with fewer federal regulations and requirements. That is, by providing more flexibility to states and communities to design their own programs, federal policy makers believe that states and communities can eliminate administrative red tape, excessive personnel, and duplication of services, and thereby save money.

However, the federal government and lawmakers may be trying to cut resources that are already in short supply. If federal resources prove to be inadequate, then states and localities will be faced with having to meet the needs with their own funds. Such new pressures on state and local budgets may affect those services funded primarily at the local level, such as public education. In addition, citizens in many states are voting for limits on state and local tax increases, which may make it even more difficult for states to find the resources to provide for needs once met with federal dollars.

Coordination and Integration of Services

In recent years, traditional child and family service delivery systems, including education, have begun doing business in new and different ways. New approaches increasingly involve coordination and collaboration across service systems, and integrate education, health, and human services for the benefit of low-income children and families.

There has been growing recognition in the past decade that different types of public services and programs often serve many of the same vulnerable families. Funding for these services comes from different government "pots" to address specific problems and populations. Families with multiple problems must go to and apply separately for each, qualify for some but not for others because of varying eligibility standards, and abide by different rules, regulations, and expectations. Additionally, when these programs are housed in different locations, access to services can be a major problem in both urban and rural areas.

To address this fragmentation, communities are working to provide a range of services in a more coordinated or integrated manner and put together more effective and individualized combinations of services based on a family's needs rather than on the nature of the services available. At the very least, families might be better served through coordination and referral or through co-location of services, sometimes called one-stop shopping, to address problems of access. Case managers can tailor a plan that works best for a particular family if given adequate authority to access and manage multiple services. Streamlining application and eligibility requirements and making more flexible use of funds from different programs can make this possible.

Another, sometimes competing, interest behind the movement toward more coordination, collaboration, and integration is cost-effectiveness and efficiency. A growing number of people, believing that government is too bureaucratic and inefficient to administer most services, are forming the backbone of the "reinventing government" movement. Proponents argue that government should be run more like a business: emphasizing consumers, reducing administrative red tape, eliminating duplication, and coordinating services. Managed care operates on these principles. As in managed care, the government is also increasingly moving toward contracting out the administration and delivery of services to private, for-profit providers.

Another broad movement calls for revitalization of entire communities and neighborhoods. Community-wide efforts seek to empower communities and their members by engaging—in addition to traditional public service providers and government entities—private enterprise, community-based organizations, nontraditional providers of services, churches, private citizens, etc. in community-building efforts. Communities are seen as whole organisms, which, when the entire range of resources and strengths available in communities is harnessed, provide healthy environments within which families can grow and flourish. If communities and neighborhoods are healthy and productive, problems can be prevented or addressed before they become serious. Services to families are seen as only a part of what makes communities and families healthy.

In many communities, individuals from diverse backgrounds and service sectors are working together to build strong services and supports for children and families through community col-

laboratives, or groups of individuals that work together to plan for, advise on, or administer new configurations of services and funds on behalf of the communities' citizens. Naturally, schools play an integral role in all neighborhoods and should be active participants in these broad-based efforts.

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENTS IN CHILD AND FAMILY POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

With these themes in mind, we will examine some of the major changes and trends occurring in human services, health care, economic development, youth development, and education. We know that child development is affected by many different factors and is dramatically influenced by the environment in which children grow and develop. We know, for example, that family income level, parental stress, parenting styles, and access to and quality of services children receive all have an impact on children's development (Collins, Jones, and Bloom, 1996). While each service arena seeks to address some of the needs of children and their families, these needs and the services and supports designed to address these needs are interconnected.

For the purposes of this issue brief, we examine those child and family policies and programs that contribute to or affect educational success of children and youth. We also focus on those programs that have undergone some transformation as a result of recent trends and developments in federal policy making. With the exception of education, these types of services and supports are funded in large part with federal dollars and therefore are largely conceived and regulated by federal policy makers. Federal policy making, however, is often based on the results of ongoing experimentation in states and communities. Although education is funded primarily with state and local resources, federal education policy has provided important direction and leadership for the education community, particularly in helping to ensure equity, encouraging innovation and the sharing of best practices, and promoting high standards for student achievement.

HUMAN SERVICES

Childhood poverty has both immediate and lasting negative effects on child development. Children who are poor are more likely than nonpoor children to have difficulty in school, to become teen parents, and, as adults, to earn less or be unemployed. Additionally, family income can have an impact on family stress levels and parents' ability to care for their children, which in turn can result in increased child stress (Collins, Jones, and Bloom, 1996). Here we examine welfare reform, workforce development programs, and changes in the federal policy focus in child welfare as they may have significant impacts on family income levels, children's development, and school success.

Welfare Reform

The most sweeping changes by far in domestic policy in the last two years occurred with the enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, a complex new welfare law signed by President Clinton. The new law emphasizes moving people quickly from welfare to work and increasing the self-reliance of welfare recipients. The law also places new focus on keeping families together and discouraging single parenthood. Numerous programs are affected by the welfare reform law, and the changes can be summarized as follows.

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant. The new law eliminates AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), an open-ended entitlement program providing cash assistance to needy families, along with the JOBS (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills) program and Emergency Assistance, and replaces these programs with the TANF block grant. The purpose of TANF is to provide assistance to needy families so they can care for their children in their own

homes, and to reduce dependency by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage. Through the block grant, states receive a capped amount of funds each year at a level set for five years. The annual funding level set for each state is based on funds received when welfare caseloads were relatively high. In states where caseloads have dropped, states have more dollars per case to invest in helping families achieve self-sufficiency. However, should caseloads rise, due to recession or other factors, states could have difficulty getting people to work with capped dollars. States must meet federally determined work participation requirements and maintain a large percentage of their previous spending levels or face reductions in their block grant allocations. TANF mandates a five-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits (states may opt for shorter time limits) and requires that adults work or perform community service after two years. Unmarried teenage mothers with minor children at least 12 weeks of age are eligible for benefits only if they live with their parents or in an adult-supervised setting and stay in school.

TANF offers states vast new authority to establish basic program goals and to determine who will qualify for assistance, what that assistance will be, the terms under which assistance will be available, the systems for delivering the assistance, whether those systems will be operated at the state or the local level, and whether the systems will be managed by private or public entities. Although states and localities have completed initial planning, many states have opted only to make changes to meet the letter of the law. These programs will continue to evolve over time as implementation progresses.

In addition to creating the TANF block grant, the new law also made changes to and cut benefits for other programs. The original legislation reduced spending by an estimated $54.5 billion over six years, primarily through changes in the Food Stamp program and reductions in benefits for legal immigrants. The following sections summarize changes in other programs, including subsequent changes to the welfare law enacted in the 1997 Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, all of which will affect public education.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI). The new law narrows the definition of childhood disability, limiting SSI eligibility to children who meet a set of official conditions. The use of assessments of a child's functioning and references to maladaptive behavior have been eliminated. An estimated 300,000 children may lose eligibility for SSI under this new definition. Those who no longer qualify for SSI will no longer be entitled to Medicaid benefits unless they are eligible on family income grounds. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that roughly 40,000 to 50,000 children would lose Medicaid eligibility under the new rules.

Child care. The law consolidates the existing child care funding sources under AFDC/JOBS, at-risk, and transitional child care with the existing Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). While total funding for child care has been increased, it is unlikely that the funding will be adequate to meet the increased demands that states' welfare work targets will create. These new demands may also reduce access to affordable child care for working poor families.

Child nutrition. The new law reduces spending on child nutrition programs by nearly $3 billion over six years. It reduced the Summer Food Service Program reimbursement rate for breakfasts, lunches, and snacks as of January 1, 1997. It eliminates School Breakfast startup and expansion grants. Under the Child Care Food Program, the law cuts reimbursement rates to those providers who are not operating in high-poverty areas or who are not considered to have low incomes them-

selves. The law does state that individuals eligible for free public education benefits under state or local law, including undocumented immigrant children, are eligible for school meal benefits if they meet eligibility requirements under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1996.

Food stamps. The new law reduces projected outlays for the Food Stamp program by $23 billion over six years (not including cuts to legal immigrants). The program remains an uncapped, individual entitlement, but constricts eligibility. For example, able-bodied recipients ages 18 to 50 with no dependents are ineligible for food stamps unless they meet a new work requirement.

Benefits to immigrants. The 1996 welfare law made substantial cuts in assistance to legal immigrants, including children. Under the 1996 law, legal immigrants would no longer receive SSI or food stamp assistance. At state option, legal immigrants may be denied TANF assistance, child care support, social services, and nonemergency Medicaid. Legal immigrants who enter the country after the enactment of the bill are barred from receiving most nonemergency, income-based federal help (including child care, food stamps, SSI, and welfare) for five years, and after five years, eligibility criteria would include consideration of the sponsor's income.

The 1997 budget reconciliation bill restored SSI benefits to noncitizens who were receiving SSI as of August 22, 1996, and for those who were residing in the United States as of August 22, 1996, and subsequently become disabled.

Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). The law reduces funding for the SSBG by 15 percent (although some of the funding was restored in the FY97 appropriations bill). The SSBG provides funding to states for a broad array of services to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency; prevent neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children and adults; prevent or reduce inappropriate institutional care; and provide admission or referral for institutional care when other forms of care are inappropriate. These funds are most commonly used by states to provide child day care, home-based services, child protective services, special services for the disabled, social support services, adoption services, case management, adult protective services, foster care for children, and prevention and intervention services.

Medicaid. Medicaid eligibility is not automatically tied directly to TANF eligibility as it was to AFDC; it must be established separately. Some families ineligible for TANF may still be eligible for Medicaid but not know it.

Child support and child welfare. The new law includes sweeping revisions of federal child support statutes and restructures the administration of child support. As a condition of receiving TANF assistance, families must assign child support rights to the state. The few foster care amendments in the law require that states consider giving preference to an adult relative over a nonrelated caregiver for foster care placements, and open up eligibility for foster care payments to for-profit child care institutions in addition to nonprofit and public institutions.

Implications for Schools

Some aspects of the new welfare law will have some immediate and direct effects on schools, while others will affect efforts to ensure educational success for all students indirectly and over time. For example, schools will have to accommodate teen parents who must return to school to receive wel-

fare benefits, but it is still unclear how new work and school demands on teen parents will affect their young children, who will eventually enter the school system themselves. States and communities are now deeply involved in planning for and implementing their new welfare programs and are determining how resources will be allocated locally. Educators should be informed about the short- and long-term implications of the new law and the important decisions that are being made, and they should be involved in the implementation process.

Workforce development and school-to-career initiatives. The emphasis of the new welfare law is on work and getting people to work quickly. Schools will be challenged to prepare students adequately for work. High-quality school-to-career initiatives and vocational education programs can support well-designed and -delivered core curricula.

For adult welfare recipients, educators must focus on delivering high-quality education related to employment and on helping those with basic skills to develop the skills they will need to move into more secure, higher-paying jobs. Adult welfare recipients who do not have high school diplomas or GEDs may also be required to use educational services, and many of them will need assistance acquiring even basic literacy skills.

Teen parents. To receive support under TANF, unmarried teen parents under the age of 20 must be in school or in an alternative approved educational setting. Schools will have to examine and enhance their capacity to educate this historically underserved population; this will involve undertaking new curricular and instructional approaches. Work-based learning opportunities also will have to be made appropriate and be sensitive to time limits for teen mothers upon their return to school. These young women will have additional needs for child care—especially infant care—and parenting education. Because the young children of these teenagers are the next generation of students, schools should consider finding opportunities for intergenerational programs that ensure school readiness for these children.

School readiness. While funding for child care has been increased under the new law, work requirements will heighten the demand for child care services, including before- and after-school care. Teen parents will need infant care, because they will be required to go back to school 12 weeks after giving birth. This increased demand for child care may exacerbate an existing tension between providing adequate custodial care and providing high-quality child development programs. Emphasizing quantity at the expense of quality could have ramifications for young children's development, school readiness, and school performance. School-linked services efforts should include and collaborate with the Head Start, child development, and child care communities to begin to address the developmental and learning needs of young children, particularly those in low-income families.

Expanded support services. A wide range of high-cost, "related services" required by the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) and state special education laws may no longer be funded for disabled children who lose Medicaid coverage as a result of new SSI eligibility standards, such as the elimination of references to "maladaptive behavior." Children who lose SSI eligibility may lose Medicaid coverage as well if they cannot qualify based on their family income level. Schools will have to determine how these services will be financed.

School-linked services are positioned to help provide access to basic health prevention and primary care services for children who become uninsured as a result of various welfare reform provisions. The state of Missouri, for example, is exploring extending Medicaid-EPSDT (Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment) coverage through managed care arrangements to all children attending schools with Title I schoolwide programs, which serve many Medicaid-insured children as well as many low-income, uninsured children.

Additional food and nutrition services to children may be necessary as a result of limited family eligibility for food stamps or reduced funding of federal child nutrition programs or Social Services Block Grant-funded food programs. Transportation services may also be needed for mothers and children (receiving TANF). Welfare recipients may also have an increased need for parenting, nutrition, and health education.

Long-term effects. It is unclear what the broader long-term effects of welfare reform will be. When the new law was enacted in August 1996, many experts predicted increases in poverty rates (Zedlewski et. al, 1996), the deterioration of physical and emotional health of children and adults, and increased mobility among students as a result of the new law's provisions. Although poverty rates among children and families have remained relatively steady since the early 1980s, many experts anticipate that moving families with children from welfare to work will not lift families out of poverty but will in fact result in smaller family incomes. Many current welfare recipients are not likely to obtain living-wage jobs or, if they do, to keep such jobs over time. New eligibility rules, restrictions, and reductions in benefits provided through "safety net" programs generally, including welfare, food stamps, Medicaid, child care, and school nutrition support, may exacerbate the problem, especially among the working poor. Increased student mobility may be attributed to welfare families' seeking better benefits in other states or moving to areas where jobs are more available (e.g., from rural areas to urban areas). Effects of policy changes on programs for low-income families might be magnified in schools serving large immigrant populations, who face many new restrictions on their benefits. If such predictions hold true, education agencies must consider the expansion of compensatory education services (e.g., Title I) for the additional children whose families are anticipated to fall below the poverty level as a result of welfare reform provisions.

Thus far, however, predicted increases in poverty and its ill effects (e.g., flooded child welfare rolls, homeless shelters, and food pantries) have not been realized. In fact, welfare rolls have shrunk significantly, and some benefits reduced or restricted in the 1996 welfare law were restored in the 1997 balanced budget act (e.g., SSI for some noncitizens). The restoration of benefits should reduce the number of those predicted to fall into poverty. It is still unclear, however, whether it is welfare reform that has led to the reductions in the rolls or a very strong economy. Many disabled children will still lose aid, and many legal immigrants will lose food stamp benefits. In the longer term, some recipients will reach their time limits and no longer qualify for benefits. Many states will struggle to meet their work participation rate mandates, which become more rigorous over time. If the economy takes a downturn and more people require welfare benefits, there may not be enough funds available to meet the demand.

There undoubtedly will be unanticipated long-run effects that will need to be addressed. Schools, school districts, and state education agencies can play an important role in helping to monitor the short- and long-term effects of this legislation on student performance and achievement. In addition, schools should be prepared for states and localities to concentrate available resources on job

training, placement, and development, and to work with lawmakers to ensure that education is viewed as an effective prevention strategy for reducing dependency on public services.

When the welfare bill became law in August 1996, the New York State Education Department decided to take a proactive rather than a reactive role in the state's planning efforts. The department formed a crosscutting working group that included staff from all parts of the department to identify education's role in implementing welfare reform. The working group's analyses and recommendations were presented in testimony at joint committee hearings before the Assembly Committees on Ways and Means, Social Services, and Children and Families in January 1997. The testimony highlighted how and why the new law would have a substantial impact on the education/vocational rehabilitation system, and also asserted that welfare reform provided real opportunities for comprehensive initiatives aimed at breaking the cycle of poverty. Through the supporting documentation provided with the testimony, the working group identified a comprehensive range of issues related to the role of education in welfare reform.

For example, the working group stated that "education/vocational rehabilitation programs must play a key role in breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty." They provided data to support the statement, including the fact that poverty and low levels of adult literacy are directly and strongly correlated, and that children growing up in poverty are more likely to drop out of school, have children out of wedlock, and be unemployed. They also stated that collaborative human service and school district programs have demonstrated improved educational and social results for children. As a proposed solution, the working group recommended taking comprehensive approaches to ensure that children from low-income families achieve early literacy by the end of elementary school and meet learning standards throughout their school years, and included examples of successful program models.

Workforce Development

With the enactment of a new welfare reform law in 1996, Congress and the President ended the entitlement of low-income children to cash benefits and began a program of aid to families in exchange for work. Through a variety of workforce development activities, the federal government is working to see that the labor market can absorb a new influx of low-skilled workers into the labor force, while it also recognizes the need for young people to be better prepared to enter the workplace and for adults to acquire the skills necessary to achieve self-sufficiency through unsubsidized employment.

An array of employment programs that focus on job preparation and training, placement, and retention are administered by the Departments of Labor and Education. Here, we briefly describe two Department of Labor programs, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and the new Welfare-to-Work initiative, authorized as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. (Education-based programs will be addressed later in this paper.)

Job Training Partnership Act. Since 1983, JTPA has provided job-training services for economically disadvantaged adults and youth, dislocated workers, and others who face significant employment barriers. JTPA seeks to move jobless individuals into permanent, self-sustaining employment. State and local governments, together with the private sector, have primary responsibility for the development, management, and administration of training programs under JTPA. Governors approve locally developed plans and are responsible for monitoring program compliance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JTPA requires that partnerships be formed among state and local governments and the business community to ensure that effective program administration is combined with private-sector employer involvement. State Job Training Coordinating Councils are appointed by governors and are composed of representatives of business, state agencies, local government, and the unemployed to recommend training components and play a role in planning employment services. States also may establish a Human Resource Investment Council, representing major federal and state human services programs, review and coordinate programs, and replace multiple advisory councils. Private Industry Councils (PICs) are appointed by local elected officials to guide and oversee job and training programs in each service delivery area. PICs serve as mechanisms for bringing the private sector into the active management of job training programs. PIC membership includes representatives from business, education, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, community-based organizations, economic development agencies, and public employment services.

Welfare-to-Work. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 authorized $3 billion over two years for a Welfare-to-Work grant initiative that provides resources for state and local governments to create job opportunities for the hardest-to-employ welfare recipients. These grants complement the services provided to welfare recipients through TANF program with job placement services, transitional employment, and support services needed to move them into lasting, unsubsidized employment. The program targets the roughly 20 percent of the adult welfare population who are most at risk of long-term welfare dependency and who have the most significant barriers to employment.

Under this program, there are two kinds of grants: formula grants to states and competitive grants to local communities. Seventy-five percent of the grant funds will be allocated for the formula grants to the states. These grants will be used to expand the capacity and capability of local systems to place eligible recipients into jobs. PICs, authorized under JTPA, will be responsible for administering the program at the local level.

The remaining 25 percent of funds will be used for competitive grants awarded directly to local governments, PICs, and private entities (such as community development corporations, community-based organizations, community action agencies, and other private organizations) who apply in conjunction with a PIC or local government. These grants will be used to find new ways to help the hardest to employ make the transition to work and to target resources in areas of high need.

Implications for Schools

The workforce development activities described above fall largely under the purview of PICs. Even the Welfare-to-Work competitive grants, which provide opportunities for innovation in this area, require coordination with PICs. PICs, local elected officials, local welfare agencies, One-Stop/Employment Service agencies, employers, and other interested community organizations should be involved in planning for—and carrying out—job-placement and job-creation activities. Such coordination will become increasingly important as the most job-ready adults find employment, leaving a growing proportion of hard-to-employ recipients on welfare caseloads.

Ideally, resources to be coordinated should include not only those available through Welfare-to-Work, TANF grant funds, and the Child Care and Development Fund, but also those available through other related activities and programs such as the JTPA program, state employment services, private sector employers, labor organizations, business and trade associations, education agencies, housing agencies, community development organizations, transportation agencies, communi-

ty-based and faith-based organizations, disability community organizations, and colleges and universities that provide some of the assistance needed by the hard-to-employ population.

Child Welfare

Over time, the child welfare system has changed dramatically. Child welfare services provided through public agencies are designed to improve and strengthen family life and to ensure that children have stable, permanent homes. They encompass a wide range of services that are designed to protect children and ensure that they have safe homes, preferably with their parents. At the federal level, child welfare services, authorized under Title IV-B and Title XX (the Social Services Block Grant) of the Social Security Act, include child protection, prevention, and early intervention activities such as family preservation and family support, and care of neglected, abused, or dependent children. In addition, reunification services are available to encourage the return home, when appropriate, of children who have been removed from their families. The Foster Care (Title IV-E) and Adoption Assistance programs help abused, neglected, or dependent children who cannot remain safely at home with their parents.

Americans have changed their views about child protection over time. Two hundred years ago, for example, people believed that children of the poor should be taken from their homes. By the beginning of the 1900s, the consensus among Americans was to remove endangered children from their families, which led to the development of the foster care system as the last refuge for children whose families could not care for them. As concerns over child abuse grew during the 1950s and 1960s, policies stressing removal and placement expanded as a means of protecting children at risk of abuse and neglect.

Today, however, publicly funded child welfare services are directed toward the dual goals of ensuring the welfare and safety of children and keeping families together. In child welfare, child mental health, and even juvenile justice, policies and programs have increasingly emphasized prevention and community-based intervention over more expensive, remedial, out-of-home and sometimes out-of-state care for children and youth. The rationale is that when families show signs of difficulty coping with parenting, communities can often provide the necessary services and supports to help families avoid involvement in the child welfare system. The current child protection system is already considered overstressed and underfunded, with both overreporting and underreporting leaving some families exposed to excessive professional intervention or to professional neglect.

As evidence of this change in focus, in 1993 the Family Preservation and Family Support Services Act was enacted to prevent the unnecessary separation of children from their families, improve the quality of care and services to children and their families, and ensure permanency for children by reuniting them with their parents, by adoption, or by another permanent living arrangement. Family preservation and family support services help state child welfare agencies to operate integrated, preventive family preservation services and community-based family support services for families at risk or in crisis. Most grant funds go directly to state governments for expenditure in accordance with their five-year plans.

Family preservation and family support services are based on a number of key principles: the welfare and safety of children and of all family members should be maintained while strengthening and preserving the family; the family as a whole should receive services that identify and enhance its strengths while meeting individual and family needs; services should be easily accessible, often

delivered in the home or in community-based settings, and should respect cultural and community differences; services should be flexible, responsive to family needs, and linked to other supports and services outside the child welfare system; services should involve community organizations and residents, including parents, in their design and delivery; and services should be intensive enough to keep children safe and meet family needs, varying between preventive and crisis services.

Implications for Schools

Child maltreatment can lead to social-emotional problems in children, lower academic achievement, and decreased family functioning. Schools can play an important role in helping to ensure the safety of children and to promote efforts to keep families together. School-based parenting education for young people, particularly for teen parents, can teach positive discipline techniques and provide knowledge about child development. Many schools already include skills-based curricula for children and parents to teach safety and protection skills, usually to prevent the sexual abuse of children (NCCANI, 1997). Engaging parents in their children's schooling more generally also enhances parents' social support networks.

Schools and school-linked services can also provide access to services and supports for vulnerable, low-income families, particularly families with children with special needs, who are more vulnerable to abuse. These services can include substance abuse treatment, mental health and health services, respite care for families with children with special needs, and home visitation. School personnel are often in a position to recognize signs of abuse or neglect and should be familiar with state requirements for reporting suspected abuse. At the same time, because school personnel are increasingly acting in a supportive role with at-risk families, they should learn about the intervention alternatives to out-of-home placement. Schools can become informed partners in public awareness campaigns as well on how and where citizens can report suspected cases of abuse or neglect.

The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation's Community Partnerships for the Protection of Children is a multiyear, four-site demonstration project in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; St. Louis, Missouri; Jacksonville, Florida; and Louisville, Kentucky. In these cities, the Clark Foundation has provided planning and implementation funds for partnerships between public child welfare agencies and community organizations to develop effective community "systems of care" that provide a wide array of flexible responses to families. These community-based efforts aim to safeguard children from abuse and neglect while also promoting the goals of family preservation and family support.

The Louisville Community Partnership project is built on an existing collaboration to serve and support students and their families. This collaboration, catalyzed by the Jefferson County Public Schools, has developed and supported school-based family resource centers and regional service centers called Neighborhood Places. Along with the schools, other partners include parents and community residents, the state's Departments of Social Services and Social Insurance, Jefferson County's Departments of Health and Human Services, Jefferson County Family Court, Seven Counties Services, and Neighborhood Place staff. For the Clark-funded Community Partnership, individuals representing each of the partners have been participating in working groups to plan for and begin implementa tion in the areas of family solutions, community networks, selected services, responsive processes, communication, and governance. Partners are currently working on reengineering the child abuse and neglect reporting hotline and creating a "neighborhood response" to child abuse and neglect reports, in which natural helpers from the community are linked with families when reports are not serious enough to warrant visits from child protective services workers. In the coming year, the focus of the Neighborhood Places will be on school attendance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HEALTH CARE

An important link exists between learning readiness and child health and development. Children and youth are most ready to learn if they are healthy, well fed, and emotionally secure. Conversely, a child's full potential to learn may be threatened by poor health, malnutrition, and/or emotional stress, especially under conditions that result from failure to immunize, poor diet, environmental hazards, undiagnosed or untreated health problems, and injuries. Therefore, access to adequate, affordable physical and mental health care through insurance coverage, managed care arrangements, and the availability of appropriate services is crucial to children's school success.

Managed Care, Children's Health Insurance, and Medicaid

In a relatively short period of time, managed care has revolutionized the health care industry, particularly as dictated by private health insurance carriers, as a method of controlling rapidly escalating health care costs.

Managed care companies limit services to those they deem "necessary and appropriate" by coordinating the delivery of services and by rewarding preventive care, which cuts the overutilization and inefficiencies of traditional fee-for-service systems while still providing quality care. The principal financing mechanism of managed care is capitation—that is, the provider agrees to provide services to a particular population for a per-person, per-year fee. At its best, capitation encourages proactive, preventive, coordinated services to patients and clients in an effort to avoid more expensive remedial care later. While many see managed care as emphasizing cutting costs and/or saving money, managed care also can provide an opportunity for better access to care and more individualized service.

Medicaid is the nation's major public insurance program for providing health and long-term care coverage to millions of low-income Americans. It is also increasingly becoming a managed care service industry. Most states have now adopted managed care programs to serve their Medicaid populations in an effort to reduce Medicaid spending, a very large expenditure in state budgets (states share with the federal government the cost of Medicaid). In some instances, states have turned to Medicaid managed care to extend coverage to those who otherwise would be uninsured. The principal populations enrolled in Medicaid managed care have been children and adults in low-income, single-parent families who receive AFDC—now TANF—and low-income pregnant women and children. However, the bulk of Medicaid expenditures goes toward long-term care for the elderly.

The 1997 budget reconciliation bill includes a child health block grant that offers states $20.3 billion in new federal funding over the next five years to expand coverage for children under the Medicaid program or to create or expand separate child health insurance programs. The goal of the block grant is to reduce the number of uninsured children by providing children with meaningful, affordable coverage. States will have wide latitude in determining eligibility criteria, but must comply with federal standards related to the benefits offered and cost-sharing requirements. How states choose to use these funds will in large part be determined by their current approaches to providing health care to low-income children.

Some states might consider existing models of health care coverage expansion involving schools as they develop their plans for the child health block grant. Florida's Healthy Kids program, for example, creates a comprehensive health insurance package for school children. All children enrolled in grades K-12 and their preschool-age siblings are eligible to participate. The benefits package is designed to emphasize prevention and to meet the unique health care needs of children, and features inpatient and outpatient care, including dental, vision, and mental health. In each school district, insurance companies bid to participate in the program and must demonstrate that they have an adequate and accessible network of providers. Schools are central to these arrangements, fostering relationships between the local project, community leaders, and business groups. They also verify student enrollment, distribute marketing materials and applications, provide parent outreach, enhance health education opportunities, and provide interpreters and translators for program activities and materials. The state-funded, nonprofit Healthy Kids Corporation manages the contractual arrangements for billing and administration of the program and manages the bidding process at each site.

It is important to note that managed care principles are being applied to other child- and family-service systems as well. The child welfare and family support arenas are two examples of systems examining the potential for capitated funding for families. This trend toward managed care also seems to have increased the use of private, for-profit providers to administer and provide public services.

Mental Health

Mental health services are often left out of the health care equation, particularly services for children. However, mental health professionals and educators are increasingly highlighting the importance of the emotional well-being of children if they are to be successful in school and to grow to be productive citizens. Mental health problems among students and within families can be significant barriers to school readiness, learning, and school attendance.

To avoid the high cost and disruption of residential, institutional, or out-of-home/out-of-state placement for children with serious emotional disturbances, many states and communities have been developing "systems of care" to address the range of children's mental health needs in communities. Because children with more serious disorders often require a combination of services, including mental health, medical, and educational services, systems of care have been developed to emphasize coordination and integration, along with collaboration among various professional disciplines and service professionals. The federal government provides funding for the development of systems of care through the Child and Adolescent Service System Program and the Children's Mental Health Services Demonstration Program. These funds target children with severe mental, behavioral, and emotional disturbances, as well as those at risk for developing them.

In the context of health insurance coverage and managed health care, mental health professionals have sought "parity" for mental health; in other words, for mental health services to be considered and covered comparably to physical health services. The mental health services community has also sought better access to and coverage of preventive services and early diagnosis and treatment for children. The federal government continues to fund community mental health services through Community Mental Health Services Block Grants to states.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Implications for Schools

Many schoolchildren already have access to some mental health services through school counselors, social workers, nurses, and psychologists, especially if these professionals can link students to additional services when they are available. However, making adequate linkages between school staff and systems of care or other providers can also be challenging. Some districts and state education agencies are contracting with private providers to provide additional mental health services in schools. Many school-linked and school-based services include access for children and their families to mental health services and substance abuse counseling.

If school-linked services providers are to be successful in providing needed health care for low-income students and their families, they must also work to become a more integral part of a service arena that is increasingly turning to managed care. Many school-based/linked services projects have been working on agreements to qualify for reimbursement from managed care companies for health services when recipients are covered by Medicaid. Some states have required managed care providers to coordinate with school-based health centers, but in states where there is no requirement, some localities have elected specifically to include school clinics in their managed care contracts.

Some school districts are working on making sure that health services continue to be available on site. In Baltimore, school-based health centers are allowed to function in managed care plans as Primary Care Case Management providers, or the coordinators of health care for children enrolled in the plans. Maryland has proposed a Section 1115 waiver (i.e., a waiver that allows states to continue receiving federal Medicaid funds while experimenting with new delivery systems) to require HMOs to contract with school-based health centers and allows adolescents to self-refer to school clinics.

In San Diego, the University of California, San Diego, the San Diego school district, and managed care organizations have formed a collaboration called the School Health Innovations Project, or SHIP. SHIP seeks to facilitate communication between school nurses and primary care physicians to enable schools to provide some health services on campus, whether or not there is a health center located at the site. Through formal arrangements between the schools and the managed care organizations, doctors can authorize the delivery of medical services—such as tuberculosis skin test readings and treatment for asthma or head lice—by school nurses, and students would be covered with the approval of primary care physicians.

Others are working to ensure that all students have access to health services. The Philadelphia school district is part of a public-private working group negotiating contracts with the HMOs providing services to Medicaid recipients in southeastern Pennsylvania. To help ensure access to services for those eligible for Medicaid, the working group is negotiating to include in the contract HMO contributions to an "access fund" for documented cases of children not receiving treatment and for formation of a high-level committee (including key members of the working group) to identify gaps in service and manage complaints.

School-linked services also are positioned to help provide access to health prevention and primary care services for children who may be uninsured or who lose coverage under new welfare law provisions. These may include children who received Medicaid-reimbursable related services required under the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), and who will continue to need them, but are no longer eligible for Medicaid coverage. As mentioned earlier, through Medicaid managed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

care arrangements with school-linked services via a federal waiver, such care could be made available to these children along with those who are already Medicaid-eligible.

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Community and economic development initiatives have sought to improve the economic and environmental conditions of inner-city neighborhoods by investing in the physical and economic capital of poor urban neighborhoods so that families living there could gain the resources to improve their lives. More recent and comprehensive community-building initiatives have combined "place" strategies with "people" strategies to strengthen the social capital that holds communities together by strengthening relationships among individuals, families, and organizations.

Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities

The Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community (EZ/EC) program, established by the federal government in 1993, was designed to afford urban and rural communities opportunities for growth and revitalization. The mission of the program is to create self-sustaining, long-term economic development in areas of pervasive poverty, unemployment, and general distress and to demonstrate how communities can achieve self-sufficiency through innovative and comprehensive strategic plans developed and implemented by alliances among private, public, and nonprofit entities.

The EZ/EC program is built on four guiding principles: 1) economic opportunity, 2) sustainable community development, 3) community-based partnerships, and 4) a strategic vision for change. Economic opportunity means employment for all residents through job creation, entrepreneurial initiatives, small business expansion, and job training. Sustainable community development entails creating a livable and vibrant community where human initiative, work, and stable families can flourish. "Community-based partnerships" should include broad participation by all segments of the community, including political and governmental leadership, community groups, health and social service groups, environmental groups, religious organizations, the private and nonprofit sectors, centers of learning, other institutions, and community residents. The "strategic vision for change" is a road map for revitalization, which integrates economic, physical, environmental, community, and human development in a comprehensive and coordinated fashion so that families and communities can work together and thrive. The strategic vision should also set goals and performance benchmarks for measuring progress.

Fifteen Empowerment Zones and close to 100 Enterprise Communities have been designated. Each EZ/EC is awarded Social Services Block Grant funds, which can be used flexibly to fund a variety of economic, social, and community development activities, as determined by Zone and Community residents. Funding must be used for economic self-support to reduce dependency; remedy neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children and adults; and preserve, rehabilitate, or reunite families. Technical assistance on strategic plan development, partnership building, and leadership development; employer tax credits; tax-free bonds for facilities (in some cases); and increased coordination of federal programs are provided to EZ/ECs by the federal government.

The city of Philadelphia, a designated Empowerment Zone, has the nation's fifth largest school system. In 1995, the Philadelphia School District adopted its education reform strategy, "Children Achieving." At that time, the school district reorganized from six large regions into 22 "clusters" corresponding to geographic neighborhoods, to encourage neighborhood schools to work together as a team. Each cluster was to form a Cluster Resource Board, led by a "lead employer partner," and was to include business, higher education, public school, community and public agency, labor, student, and parent representatives in order to improve student achievement and bring new resources to schools and neighborhoods.

The Kensington cluster, one of the most distressed of Philadelphia's clusters, was the first to organize a Cluster Resource Board. Through its involvement in Empowerment Zone efforts, in 1996 CoreStates Bank decided to take the lead on the Kensington Cluster Resource Board, which adopted a school-to-careers approach. After identifying community needs, the Board agreed on a set of objectives that included improving graduation rates, providing greater college access, developing jobs, and building community ownership of Cluster schools. The Board then developed new mentoring, work-based learning, and job-shadowing opportunities for students, which helped to improve student attendance rates, reenergize neighborhood participation in the school, and enhance professional development opportunities for Cluster teachers and administrators.

Housing

Housing plays an important role in families' and children's lives. Where one's home is located determines what opportunities are available for education, health care, employment, and social networks, as well as what hazards exist in the environment, such as crime and violence, pollution, and disease. The condition, size, and quality of a family's home also can have a significant impact on the health and safety of family members (in the case of lead poisoning, for example), not to mention on the family's sense of dignity and self-respect. In poor, inner-city neighborhoods, families often reside in housing that is substandard and overcrowded, but saps a disproportionately large share of their incomes.

Low-income families with children face some of the most severe housing problems and bear the most severe housing cost burdens. Low-income families often live in housing with physical problems, and the vast majority of overcrowded housing units in the United States are occupied by families with children (Bratt, 1996). Many children experience prolonged or recurrent homelessness; families are the fastest-growing homeless population in the United States.

Because of the relatively high cost of housing for low-income households, these families' housing situations can be extremely tenuous. Many low-income families become homeless at least once, but relatively few of these families will readmitted to shelters once they leave. If a family gets a housing subsidy or a housing placement, they are unlikely to return to the shelter system (Weinreb, 1996). However, cuts in housing programs reduce the number of discharge possibilities for people and increase the pressure on emergency housing systems to increase their capacity.

Children who live in inadequate housing and homeless children often experience setbacks in developmental growth, educational achievement, nutrition and overall physical health, as well as difficulty developing socialization skills and age-appropriate behaviors (Weinreb, 1996; FIFCFS, 1997). Nonwhite families and families with a single female head-of-household are overrepresented in substandard housing situations as well as in the homeless population, and the combination of segre-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

gation and poverty appears to contribute to poor educational outcomes for the children of these families. Common school-related problems among children with housing problems include frequent movement among schools, questions about district residency, delays in transferring records, difficulty in obtaining school clothes and supplies, and transportation problems.

The current federal housing assistance system is extremely complex; federal housing policies and programs have evolved in a fragmented manner, because they have historically sought to address a variety of objectives. Housing-related programs are administered by a multitude of federal agencies, the most familiar of which is the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. While many housing programs were initially developed to meet the goal of providing decent, affordable housing, in more recent years, this goal has been pursued in conjunction with efforts to promote self-sufficiency.

Currently available housing-related strategies include providing incentives and supports to the private sector through subsidies for rental housing; supports or direct assistance to nonprofit organizations (in the case of community development corporations [CDCs], for example); and public strategies, which include residency in public housing developments. Federal subsidies for rental vouchers represent the major form of federal low-income housing assistance. Public housing, administered locally by public housing authorities, is commonly situated in low-income, urban neighborhoods. Other federally subsidized housing has also been situated in suburban areas. Families' access to affordable housing can mean the difference between living above or below the poverty line, yet many families who are eligible for housing assistance receive none because the demand far exceeds the supply.

In recent years, a number of federal initiatives have focused on incorporating self-sufficiency objectives into housing programs and policies. These programs typically combine housing and social services—more specifically, welfare. A number of other successful programs have merged public and private financial resources to achieve similar objectives. Many experts believe that nothing short of full integration of housing and support services will accomplish long-term, sustainable self-sufficiency for homeless families. The McKinney Act of 1987, reauthorized in 1990, provided the most comprehensive approach to assisting the homeless to date. Housing policy has subsequently shifted to recognize the complex array of services necessary to help homeless families or those at risk of homelessness achieve self-sufficiency by taking a "continuum of care" approach. Programs now focus not only on providing emergency shelter, but on transitional housing, rehabilitative services, and permanent housing as well.

Although the public housing and human services systems have evolved and operated relatively independently for years, some hybrid approaches have emerged that address combined housing and self-sufficiency objectives. CDCs and family support centers connected to public housing developments are among the best known. These programs combine a range of support services for families, as well as provide affordable housing to their residents. A CDC is a nonprofit organization committed to improving economic conditions, providing affordable housing, and/or delivering social services. The vast majority of CDCs are involved in creating affordable housing. In addition to addressing concrete needs, CDCs attempt to enhance the political clout of a local community and to provide opportunities for individual, social, and economic empowerment. CDCs are generally under the control of the community, with a majority of the board consisting of local residents. Support services provided within or near public housing might include child care, transportation,

remedial education, education to enable participants to complete high school, job training and preparation, substance abuse treatment and counseling, training in homemaking and parenting, training in money management and household management, etc.

Lafayette Courts in Baltimore, Maryland, is one of the best-known efforts to provide enhanced educational and employment opportunities to public housing residents. Lafayette Courts has more than 800 units and houses some 2,000 residents, more than half of whom are under 18. Before the initiation of services, residents were plagued with problems common to very low-income households. These problems included inadequate prenatal care and a lack of basic skills among young mothers, and among children, a lack of early childhood stimulation, abuse, neglect, and poor nutrition. By adolescence, many of these children were lost to drugs, alcoholism, out-of-wedlock pregnancy, and crime. The Family Development Center at Lafayette Courts is funded and administered by the City of Baltimore. Its programs have included education and job training for adults, health care and child care services for children, and support services for teens. When residents enroll at the Family Development Center, they become members rather than participants in programs, and they are enrolled as families rather than as individuals. Case managers then work with family members to determine which programs would be appropriate. The Family Development Center has been successful at involving a large number of families in its programs. JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act) participation increased dramatically. Residents' educational aspirations increased, as did their self-esteem, and residents felt they had greater control over their lives. Lafayette Courts served as a prototype for the federal Family Public Housing Family Investment Center Program, created in 1990.

Implications for Schools

Schools are becoming more active, integral players in broader community and economic development strategies but often are seen as the last or most reluctant partner to come on board. However, under welfare reform, schools will be challenged to prepare students adequately for work through school-to-career and vocational education programs, and they will also be challenged to keep students, particularly teen parents, in school. In addition, if benefits to families are reduced under welfare reform, families may find it even more difficult to maintain adequate housing situations. A high degree of family mobility has been shown to have a negative effect on student achievement. Excessive student mobility can be reduced when schools work with community partners to educate families about how mobility affects children and to provide supportive services to families (Schuler, 1990).

If schools and educators are to be full partners in efforts to promote self-sufficiency, they must be involved in economic and community development efforts that contribute to job creation and ensure that job readiness efforts are linked to available employment. They must also be prepared to provide support to parents, whether teenage parents or parents of young children in school, to help them meet the demands of work and raising successful learners (e.g., through parenting education, family support services, and family involvement activities).

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

Adolescents face many obstacles as they grow and develop toward productive adulthood, but those living in distressed neighborhoods with few social supports, jobs, or recreational opportunities are particularly at risk. Delinquency, teenage pregnancy, substance abuse, and school failure are among the most worrisome youth problems present in these neighborhoods.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The federal government historically has supported a hodgepodge of youth development initiatives. As these programs have attempted to address a wide range of youth problems, they have been housed in a variety of federal departments, including the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Justice, and Labor. However, to date there has been no coherent federal youth policy focus.

In recent years, policy makers, educators, and private citizens alike have become increasingly concerned about escalating rates of violence among youth. In 1994, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, known as the "Crime Bill," was enacted following a heated debate about the role of prevention programs in stemming the tide of crime and violence among America's youth. In addition to its traditional focus on prison construction, increased law enforcement, and more punitive sentencing policies, the Crime Bill also authorized significant funding for crime prevention initiatives aimed at keeping youth from becoming involved in violent crime.

Despite the fact that much of the funding authorized for prevention activities under the Crime Bill was not appropriated, the bill's emphasis on prevention focused renewed attention on the important role of youth development programs in communities. Researchers and practitioners have long recognized that high-quality youth development programs can be effective in heading off more serious problem behaviors and circumstances among youth as they mature. However, the debate that arose during congressional deliberations around the Crime Bill also pointed to the need for more sound, research-based evidence of improved outcomes for youth as a result of these programs.

Prevention-oriented programs that address the needs of the general youth population and at-risk youth range from recreation programs (such as the Boys and Girls Clubs and midnight basketball) to job training programs to youth service and leadership initiatives. Many of these programs are located in schools, either administered by schools or administered by outside agencies but housed on school campuses. In cases where outside agencies run the programs, schools typically provide space, maintenance, and coordination between outside agency staff and school personnel.

Increasingly, however, researchers, practitioners, governments, and private funders have been turning to multifaceted, community-wide initiatives to promote positive youth development and to address the complex needs of at-risk youth. The strength of these efforts lies in both their multidimensionality (i.e., intervening simultaneously on several fronts) as well as their focus on the development of healthier communities within which at-risk youth are less likely to engage in risky behaviors. These approaches involve a broad spectrum of agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals that together have an impact on youth.

Youth Fair Chance is a national, community-focused youth services demonstration funded by the U.S. Department of Labor and authorized by 1992 amendments to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Youth Fair Chance harnessed the cooperation of local businesses, schools, and residents in high-poverty urban and rural neighborhoods to help focus on common youth concerns such as drug and gang involvement, teen pregnancy, employment and training, lack of sports, recreation, and family support, etc. The in-school component in high schools helped students make the transition from school to work. It also provided counseling, mentoring, job search assistance, recreation and sports, and other services. The out-of-school component helped improve the education, training, and employment opportunities for youth so that they could get and keep jobs.

Most Youth Fair Chance programs have had a positive impact on youth, reducing the number of teen births, the incidence of juvenile arrests, and dropout rates among high school youth. The availability and intensity of targeted services (addressing a specific problem such as teen pregnancy) appeared to be a factor contributing to favorable outcomes. Other contributing factors included having high-quality case management, a flexible approach, high levels of community involvement, and linkages among youth services and streamlined access.

Implications for Schools

Historically, schools have been central to many youth development activities, programs, and initiatives, because these activities can enhance young people's educational success. Keeping schools open before and after school and during the summer provides communities with safe and drug-free places for children and youth to study and play. Extended learning opportunities reinforce students' core academic skills, such as reading, math, and science; expand their knowledge of subjects like arts and computer science; offer classes in life skills like drug awareness and violence prevention; and provide a safe and constructive environment in which to spend time, under the supervision of educators and trained volunteers. These programs are often facilitated by collaborations among parents, educators, colleges, work-study students, libraries, youth groups, volunteer organizations, cultural institutions, local businesses, and community organizations.

By the same token, schools can learn from and partner with youth development organizations to provide supports and opportunities for youth to build the broad range of competencies they need to prepare fully for effective adult lives. These collaborations recognize the importance of building on youth assets rather than focusing on their problems and deficits. Increasing the presence of "protective factors" that promote positive youth development includes creating opportunities for caring relationships, setting high expectations and clear standards, encouraging participation in high-quality activities, allowing youth to make a contribution, and supplying a continuity of supports (Cahill, 1996). For example, schools can increase the number of youth workers and volunteers who are present in distressed urban neighborhoods by opening their doors during evenings and weekends to enhance opportunities for youth to establish caring relationships and a continuity of supports in their neighborhoods.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Beacons initiative in New York City is one of the largest public-sector investments in the country for community schools. With 40 sites Beacons operate in every community school district in New York City. Neighborhood schools are the hub for the services and activities provided by the Beacons, but the programs are run by community-based youth organizations. Parents help determine the priorities of each Beacon. The Beacons offer youth and families a rich mix of supports: diverse activities for youth, such as arts instruction, counseling and peer tutoring, leadership programs, and community service. Family programs may include health services and/or clinics, employment preparation, and college-level courses on-site. Some schools also house child welfare preventive services. Activities and services are available after school, on weekends, and during the summer, with some Beacon coordinators on-site during school hours.

FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In the past five years, most of the major federal education programs have been reauthorized and realigned for unprecedented coherence. Although federal programs provide a small percentage of overall education funds, they serve to help define and set national education priorities and chart a course for schools. The current federal policy framework is designed to reflect an increased understanding that many factors affect educational success and to help states and localities ensure that all children and youth— especially the disadvantaged—learn.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act sets forth a state planning structure for standards-based reform to achieve improved student performance. More important, Goals 2000 articulates a belief at the federal policy level that virtually all students can achieve to high levels if they are taught to high levels. The Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994 (the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act), particularly Title I, the reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act are also coordinated with Goals 2000.

Both Goals 2000 and IASA focus on high standards for all children and attempt to give schools and school districts the flexibility they need to ensure that those standards are met. These programs also strive to provide schools and school districts the resources and tools they need to improve the quality of teaching and learning both in and out of school. While much of the focus is on in-school learning, there is also a significant focus on linking with families and with community institutions and organizations that focus on the overall well-being of children and families.

Increased flexibility in these programs should allow schools to become better partners in community change efforts, as well as to engage additional partners in their own efforts to improve student achievement. For the purposes of this paper, we highlight those aspects of Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the IASA, the IDEA, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and adult and vocational education that promote innovation and education reform through increased flexibility, integration, linkages, and partnerships.

Goals 2000: Educate America Act

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act sets into law national education goals to be achieved by the year 2000 in the areas of school readiness; school completion; student achievement and citizenship; mathematics and science; adult literacy and lifelong learning; safe, disciplined, and alcohol- and drug-free schools; teacher education and professional development; and parental participation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goals 2000 is the first federal education act that helps states and communities build on and coordinate their existing reform efforts rather than creating a new, discrete program. Goals 2000 encourages each state to develop challenging academic standards for students; it provides incentive grants for schools, communities, and states to support their own effective approaches to improving student achievement; it provides funds to states and school districts for better teacher training and professional development; it encourages parents to get more involved in the education of their children, and it provides the Secretary of Education with new waiver authority to assist states and local communities in implementing school improvements.

- *Comprehensive school improvement plans.* Goals 2000 provides funds to states and communities to design and implement comprehensive school improvement plans to help all children meet challenging academic standards and make progress toward the national education goals or toward similar local and state goals. States must give most of their Goals 2000 funds to local school districts or consortia of districts and others to develop action plans that improve student achievement, discipline, and accountability as well as professional development for teachers and preservice teacher education. In many states, funds are being used to involve parents, teachers, administrators, businesspeople, and others in the community to develop and implement local strategies for improving teaching and learning.

- *Ed-Flex Demonstration Program.* Goals 2000 establishes an educational flexibility (Ed-Flex) demonstration program under which the Secretary may give up to 12 state education agencies the authority to waive certain federal statutory or regulatory requirements for themselves, or for their districts and schools. Ed-Flex waiver authority may be granted for up to five years. To be eligible to apply for Ed-Flex status, state education agencies must have approved state improvement plans under Goals 2000. State education agencies also must waive their own related statutory or regulatory requirements while holding school districts and schools affected by the waivers accountable for the performance of their students.

Improving America's Schools Act

The Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994 reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act and provided funds for aid to state and local elementary and secondary education programs. This comprehensive measure made changes to many existing elementary and secondary education programs, fine-tuned other initiatives, created new funding opportunities for state and local education agencies, and refocused the federal government's support on efforts that strive for high achievement by all students.

- *Title I.* The largest proportion of IASA funds (about two-thirds) is distributed through the Title I program to support supplementary services that improve the educational performance of students in schools with a large proportion of children from low-income families. IASA reauthorized various Title I programs, such as the Even Start program for preschoolers and their parents, the migrant education program, and the state program for neglected or delinquent youth.

  Schoolwide programs. Schools in which at least 50 percent of students from low-income families are eligible for schoolwide status. These schools are able to combine most of their federal education program funds, not solely their Title I funds, to support schoolwide reform rather than serving specific students who have been identified as needing additional help.

These schools may be exempt from most requirements of the federal programs without a waiver, so long as the intent and purposes of the programs are met.

Parent involvement. The parental participation provisions of Title I have been restructured to serve as a means for helping all students to meet challenging academic standards. School partnerships with parents should benefit not only students and parents, but schools and communities as well, and the 1994 provisions provide greater opportunity for families to participate directly in school governance and in the design and implementation of state school reform plans. Schools and districts must also build capacity for parents to be involved in their children's schooling. Capacity-building activities might include literacy programming, parent resource centers, and opportunities for parents to learn about child development and child rearing.

Fienberg-Fisher Elementary School is a "full-service community school" in South Miami Beach, Florida, that serves a large immigrant and low-income population. As a community school, a Comer School (which emphasizes school-community planning and high expectations for all children), and a Title I schoolwide program, Fienberg-Fisher works to create a positive learning environment and improved academic achievement by providing for the educational, social, medical, cultural, and physical needs of students and families. Foundation grants allowed Fienberg-Fisher to hire a parent coordinator/social worker who conducted outreach activities to engage the involvement of parents. Parents then created RAIN (Referral & Information Network) which provides free assistance to parents and promotes awareness of social services, government agencies, and the school's programs for students. One-stop social services, a health/mental health center, a child care center, and two Head Start classrooms are also located on-site. Fienberg-Fisher parents serve on school management and school improvement teams, help out in classrooms and in the family resource center, and participate in Saturday and after-school programs with their children. Fienberg-Fisher student performance has improved steadily since 1993 and has exceeded performance goals and expectations.

- *Safe and Drug-free Schools.* The Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities program (Title IV of IASA) is the federal government's primary vehicle for reducing drug, alcohol and tobacco use, and violence through education and prevention activities in schools. Under IASA, the scope of the program was expanded to include activities to prevent youth violence while continuing to support school- and community-based drug education and prevention programming.

  The program encourages community-wide strategies by requiring that local education agencies develop their drug and violence prevention plans in cooperation with local government, businesses, parents, medical and law enforcement professionals, and community-based organizations. In addition, the program authorizes a broader range of prevention activities. It authorizes "the promotion of before- and after-school recreational, instructional, cultural, and artistic programs in supervised community settings." Activities can include mentoring, comprehensive health education, community service and service learning projects, conflict resolution, and peer mediation.

- *Coordinated social and health services.* Under Title XI of IASA, school districts may use up to 5 percent of their total IASA funds (including Title I) to coordinate social and health serv-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ices for students. Coordinated services projects provide a mechanism to help children and their families address factors outside the classroom that can adversely affect the ability of a child to learn and reach high academic standards.

Reallocated funding under Title XI may be used to develop, implement, or expand a coordinated services project. These funds can be used to hire a services coordinator, make renovations to existing buildings, purchase operating equipment, improve communication and information sharing among entities participating in the coordinated services project, provide training to teachers and other personnel involved in the project, or conduct a needs assessment (required for the project).

Title XI (coordinated services) funds have been approved for a variety of uses:

- The Dallas Public Schools use Title XI to provide partial funding for an office of Interagency Collaboration in the central administration, and to provide oversight of nine Coordinated Services Centers located throughout the school district.
- An elementary school in Colton, California, uses the Title XI option to employ an on-site specialist to assist families in accessing social and health services, as the school focuses on serving the needs of the "whole child."
- In the San Francisco Unified School District, Title XI funds were used to hold a city-wide conference on youth development and family support, which produced an agreement to conduct school-community needs assessments and form a working group to develop strategies for overcoming service barriers and to minimize duplication of effort.

- *Charter Schools Demonstration Program.* Public charter schools operate within the public school system in accordance with state law but are released from most regulatory requirements (except civil rights, health and safety, and financial audit requirements) in exchange for developing and implementing a plan to achieve better results in student learning. The theory behind charter schools is that freeing schools from rules and regulations will foster innovation and experimentation and enable schools to more effectively educate students. IASA provides start-up grants to public charter schools in states with charter school laws, for up to three years. Most federal education statutory and regulatory requirements may be waived. States can also use funds under Goals 2000, the IASA, and other federal programs to support the development and operations of charter schools.

- *Consolidated planning.* Under IASA, states can submit a single state plan for most federal funds supporting elementary and secondary education. Local school districts may also develop and submit to the state a single plan for many federal programs, including, for example, Title I, Safe and Drug-free Schools, Eisenhower Professional Development, etc. The development of a single plan eliminates the need to develop separate, often overlapping, plans for many federal programs and allows schools to take more comprehensive approaches to serving children and their families in schools.

- *Flexible funding.* IASA allows, with the approval of the state education agency, school districts to consolidate administrative funds under Title I and other major IASA programs. Additionally, with the approval from the state education agency, IASA allows school districts to shift a district's unused IASA funding in one program to another IASA program. A district may take up to 5 percent of the total IASA funding from one program and move it to another IASA program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IDEA Reauthorization

The 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) also brings IDEA into the new policy framework established in Goals 2000. The amendments to IDEA aim to strengthen academic expectations and accountability for the over five million children with disabilities in this nation. It raises expectations for children with disabilities; increases parental involvement in the education of their children; ensures that regular education teachers are involved in planning and assessing children's progress; includes children with disabilities in assessments, performance goals, and reports to the public; and supports quality professional development for all personnel who are involved in educating children with disabilities.

The reauthorization also provides new flexibility for schools by allowing for the limited inclusion of IDEA into schoolwide programs. Previously IDEA was the only major K-12 formula grant program that could not be combined into a schoolwide program under the IASA. The reauthorized IDEA no longer prohibits the combining of IDEA and Title I funds, although there is a limit to the amount of IDEA funds that can be combined, and all IDEA program requirements must remain intact. In other words, schools can now combine IDEA funds with other federal, state, and local funds to upgrade the entire educational program, and therefore have more freedom to coordinate and integrate efforts between IDEA and other schoolwide programs.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act provides federal funds to states to develop statewide systems for career exploration and job training targeted to youth. The three fundamental elements of school-to-work systems are school-based learning, work-based learning, and activities that connect the two. School-based learning and curricula are restructured so that students learn how academic subjects relate to work. Work-based learning provides students with opportunities to study complex subject matter and learn workplace skills in a hands-on environment. School-based learning and work-based learning are connected through program coordination and administration, exchanges between school personnel and employers, and student support, such as career counseling and postsecondary education placement.

States make subgrants to local partnerships between businesses and schools in order to carry out these programs. The U.S. Secretaries of Education and Labor jointly administer this program and can waive federal statutory and regulatory requirements for states and local partnerships in states with approved School-to-Work state plans. The waiver provisions of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act overlap with those in IASA and Goals 2000. The U.S. Secretary of Labor can also waive many requirements of the JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act).

Adult and Vocational Education

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act provides funds for vocational-technical programs offered in secondary and postsecondary schools. Funds may be used in accordance with state-developed plans to support activities ranging from prevocational courses for secondary school students to retraining adults in response to changing technological and labor market conditions. Vocational-technical education is the "first-chance" system that trains the majority of the nation's youth who will not immediately seek a four-year baccalaureate degree for jobs and further education. The system also serves out-of-school youth, workers in need of retraining, and adults seeking to leave the welfare rolls, all of whom must upgrade their academic and occupational skills to become self-sufficient and compete for higher-skill, higher-wage jobs.

The Adult Education Act state grant program is the major source of federal support for basic skills programs, providing educational opportunities for adults over the age of 16 not currently enrolled in school and who lack a high school diploma or the basic skills to function effectively in the workplace and in their daily lives. The program helps approximately four million educationally disadvantaged adults achieve literacy, certification of high school equivalency, and English language proficiency. Adult education is the route many out-of-school youth, welfare recipients, and unemployed or underemployed adults follow to upgrade their skills for entry and success in vocational-technical education or job training/retraining programs. Parents who need basic skills to help their children succeed in school also benefit from adult education.

In the 104th Congress, both the House and Senate passed landmark legislation to streamline federal support for workforce preparation and to enable better integration of education and job training programs by states and localities, but a bipartisan conference agreement was not reached. Reauthorizing legislation in both houses will be considered and redesigned in the 105th Congress.

Implications for Schools

With the new emphasis on accountability for results, schools are now being held responsible not only for seeing that students meet new, high standards, but also for seeing that all students achieve to high levels. Increasingly, educators—particularly those working in high-poverty neighborhoods—are recognizing that they must improve student achievement through strategies that address student needs both in and outside of schools.

Federal education programming now provides for fewer restrictions in planning, administration, and the use of federal funds. Goals 2000, for example, provides for comprehensive school improvement plans and the Ed-Flex program. The IASA also provides for additional administrative and programming flexibility through revised Title I schoolwide, charter school demonstration, consolidated planning, and flexible funding guidelines. Moreover, the partnerships with families and communities crucial to providing for the multiple learning needs of children are encouraged and strengthened through IASA's Title I parent involvement, Safe and Drug-free Schools, and Title XI Coordinated Services provisions. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act also helps to make the important connection between education and work and promotes the necessary linkages among schools, businesses, and local economies.

These programs now provide state and local education agencies with new flexibility that will allow educators to plan more comprehensively and to take more innovative and creative approaches, while encouraging the partnerships between and among schools, parents, and communities necessary to improving teaching, learning, and learning readiness. Such flexibility also should permit schools and educators to become better partners in efforts to enhance and strengthen neighborhoods and communities.

BECOMING A PART OF THE SOLUTION

Recent changes to policies and programs in social services, health care, economic development, youth development, and education have the potential for both positive and negative effects on the children and families served by them. On one hand, much of the new flexibility being promoted by the federal government allows states and communities to explore new administrative arrangements and to develop new linkages among various service delivery systems. On the other hand, along with that flexibility have come reductions in federal resources and an increased need for states and communities to develop the capacity to serve families effectively. Many are concerned about the harmful effects of federal cuts on vulnerable children and their families at the same time that there is added pressure on states and localities to be accountable for improving results.

Schools play a crucial and central role in the lives of children and their families, and a high-quality education continues to be the best prevention for dependency on public services and other social problems. But while many have long recognized educators' and schools' potential as partners to improve the supports and services available to children and families, too often schools have been the last to come to the table, reluctant to venture beyond their traditional role with students inside school. However, with a broader focus, educators can harness the resources of families and communities to help improve achievement levels and at the same time become better partners in building stronger and more supportive communities and neighborhoods.

The new policy climate presents educators and schools with new opportunities to become active partners in community efforts, particularly in low-income areas, by developing new or enhancing existing school-linked or school-based services. Indeed, there has been a proliferation of such services initiatives in high-poverty areas—in urban centers and rural communities alike. These collaborations, which cut across traditional service arenas and bring together diverse interests and stakeholders, can help with setting priorities across agencies and programs, creating and testing new approaches to service delivery, developing more integrated and individualized approaches to serving needy families, harnessing existing resources in the community, and working toward results-based accountability.

School-community partnerships and school-linked services are uniquely positioned to contribute to the success of these new policy and program directions, and to improve the educational achievement of students. But in order for these efforts to be successful, educators must learn about and capitalize on the range of new directions and opportunities to improve the lives and life chances of children, youth, and families.

Through a partnership between the Children's Aid Society, the New York City Board of Education, and the local school district, Community School IS 218, a public middle school, and its sister school, Elementary School PS 5, have one of the nation's most ambitious and comprehensive models of community schooling. Located in the Washington Heights/Inwood neighborhood, a community of primarily low-income immigrant families, both schools offer on-site medical and dental care, mental health counseling, family support services, and extended-day tutoring, recreation, and education programs for students, families, and community residents. The schools are open from 7:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., six days a week, year-round. All services are fully integrated with each other and with the schools' academic mission. For example, after-school activities give students opportunities to practice skills learned during the day that are thematically connected to the curriculum. Students and families also have opportunities to learn entrepreneurial skills together. Friday afternoon parent support sessions provide information that helps and strengthens families with information about what is happening in school and how families can serve as first teachers. Early childhood programs focus on building informal family support networks and school readiness. These community schools call for a sustained partnership with parents, community-based organizations, area health care providers, local businesses, and universities, giving teachers and school administrators a powerful support structure.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SELECTED REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

Bratt, Rachel. (1996). *Housing Policy and Family Self-Sufficiency.* A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar.

Cahill, Michele. (1996). *Schools and Community Partnerships: Reforming Schools, Revitalizing Communities.* Schools and Community Working Papers. Chicago, IL: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Collins, A., Jones, S., & Bloom, H. (1996). *Children and Welfare Reform: Highlights from Recent Research.* New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University School of Public Health.

The Education Trust. (Undated). *A New Chance: Making the Most of Title I.* Washington, DC: Author.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (1997). *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being.* Washington, DC: Author.

Haertel, G.D., & Wang, M.C. (1997). *Coordination, Cooperation, Collaboration: What We Know About School-linked Services.* Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University for Research in Human Development and Education.

IEL Policy Exchange and Center on Education Policy. (1997). *Federal Education Programs: A Guide Book for Community Innovation.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Association of Child Advocates and National Health Law Program. (1996). *Medicaid Managed Care: An Advocate's Guide for Protecting Children.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information. (1997). *Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect.* Washington, DC: Author.

Schuler, David B. (Fall 1990). Effects of Family Mobility on Student Achievement. *ERS Spectrum,* 8(4), 17-24.

Weinreb, Jenni. (1996). *Housing Is Not Enough: Helping Homeless Families Achieve Self-Sufficiency.* A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar.

Zedlewski, S., Clark, S., Meier, E., & Watson, K. (1996). *Potential Effects of Congressional Welfare Reform Legislation on Family Incomes.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").